

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress  
2nd Session

Vote No. 298

October 6, 1998, 3:15 p.m.  
Page S-11569 Temp. Record

## AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Conference, Passage

**SUBJECT:** Conference report to accompany the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1999 . . . H.R. 4101. Agreeing to the report.

### ACTION: CONFERENCE REPORT AGREED TO, 55-43

**SYNOPSIS:** The conference report to accompany H.R. 4101, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1999, will provide \$59.949 billion in new budget authority (of which \$13.65 billion will be discretionary budget authority). This amount is \$10.156 billion more than provided last year. The increase is p

(See other side)

YEAS (55)			NAYS (43)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (50 or 91%)		Democrats (5 or 12%)	Republicans (5 or 9%)	Democrats (38 or 88%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (2)
Abraham	Helms	Boxer	Burns	Akaka	Johnson		Glenn- <sup>2</sup>
Allard	Hutchinson	Breaux	Gregg	Baucus	Kennedy		Moynihan- <sup>2AY</sup>
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Feinstein	Kyl	Biden	Kerrey		
Bennett	Inhofe	Landrieu	Santorum	Bingaman	Kerry		
Bond	Jeffords	Leahy	Thomas	Bryan	Kohl		
Brownback	Kempthorne			Bumpers	Lautenberg		
Campbell	Lott			Byrd	Levin		
Chafee	Lugar			Cleland	Lieberman		
Coats	Mack			Conrad	Mikulski		
Cochran	McCain			Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Collins	McConnell			Dodd	Murray		
Coverdell	Murkowski			Dorgan	Reed		
Craig	Nickles			Durbin	Reid		
D'Amato	Roberts			Feingold	Robb		
DeWine	Roth			Ford	Rockefeller		
Domenici	Sessions			Graham	Sarbanes		
Enzi	Shelby			Harkin	Torricelli		
Faircloth	Smith, Bob			Hollings	Wellstone		
Frist	Smith, Gordon			Inouye	Wyden		
Gorton	Snowe						
Gramm	Specter						
Grams	Stevens						
Grassley	Thompson						
Hagel	Thurmond						
Hatch	Warner						

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business  
2—Necessarily Absent  
3—Illness  
4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

any sanction against India or Pakistan for a period of 1 year, except for sanctions dealing with dual-use exports or military sales; the conference report does not contain the Senate provision exempting food and medicine from unilateral sanctions unless: the President determines that they will advance United States national security interests; they are against a country that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; or they are against a country that systematically denies access to food, medicine, or medical care to individuals on the basis of political beliefs or as a means of coercion or punishment (for related debate, see vote Nos. 203-204); the conference report does not contain the Senate provision requiring a pilot project to require the disclosure of the terms of livestock sales (for related debate, see vote No. 205); the conference report does not contain Senate provisions on meat and fresh produce country-of-origin labeling requirements; the Secretary of Agriculture will be required to submit a plan for the lifting of the ban on interstate distribution of State-inspected meat; the conference report does not contain the House provision placing limitations on the Food and Drug Administration regarding the abortion-inducing drug RU-486; and the conferees direct that the Secretary of Agriculture will ensure that the forfeiture penalty in the sugar loan program will not apply for any purpose other than an actual forfeiture resulting in the reduction of the statutory price support loan levels for sugarcane or sugar beets; they further direct that the penalty will not be considered in the calculation of any sugar forfeiture price level.

**Those favoring** passage contended:

President Clinton has not spent a whole lot of time in Washington this year. He has spent a lot of time visiting other countries, and he has spent a lot of time fundraising, but he has not bothered to work with Congress on resolving pressing needs of the country, including the need to help America's farmers through the current agricultural crisis. As the evidence has mounted that he is guilty of perjury, subornation of perjury, and obstruction of justice, he has spent less and less time in Washington. Now that it appears that the House is about to begin formal impeachment hearings, he has returned to Washington and suddenly announced that he is very concerned about America's farmers and that he is going to veto this bill because it does not give them enough emergency aid. It is a rather remarkable claim, considering that he requested, just 2 weeks ago, only half as much emergency aid as this bill will provide. The appearance is that he is trying to divert attention from the scandal.

The claim he is now making is that the conference report is unacceptable because it does not provide assistance under the terms desired by Senate Democrats. Those terms effectively will undo the Freedom to Farm bill by shoving the country back toward the old system of the Federal Government trying to control prices by telling farmers what, when, where, and how much they can plant. For anyone who thinks that was a great system, we note that under it the number of farmers in America declined from 7 million to 2 million. Our colleagues' proposal to give aid by guaranteeing a minimum price for crops will only encourage more production in excess of demand. We oppose that proposal. We emphatically do not want to encourage more production when we already have bumper crops and not enough buyers because that will just lead to even lower prices, require the Federal Government to make even higher payments, and inevitably lead to attempts to ration production.

The solution that is needed now, and which is followed by this bill, is to give higher transition payments and to provide disaster relief to farmers who have lost their crops. With the aid in this bill, farm income will be raised to the 1996 level, and will be higher than the average in the 1990s. We agree still more needs to be done, especially to open up foreign markets (we note that the Clinton Administration has options to increase exports and thus raise prices, but it has failed to exercise that option). We will work with our colleagues to open foreign markets for our agricultural products, to reform crop insurance, to allow income averaging for farmers, and to make numerous other reforms on which bipartisan agreement is possible. However, we will not go back to the old command-and-control system of agriculture. We know many of our Democratic colleagues intend to oppose this conference report because they hope that we will then negotiate and agree to increase the price supports. We tell our colleagues that we will negotiate on other matters, but we will not give in to that demand. We are disappointed that we have reached this point. During the delay that will result in passing this bill many more farmers will go bankrupt. It is very unfortunate for farmers that President Clinton, at the last moment, has decided to get involved in this bill by issuing a veto threat. We really have no idea if he intends to drag this issue out for political reasons. For the sake of America's farmers, we sincerely hope that he will work with us to pass a bill quickly.

**Those opposing** passage contended:

This bill simply does not contain enough emergency funding, and it is not targeted well enough. The Democratic alternative proposal, which the Senate has voted on twice before (see vote Nos. 200 and 267), is a preferable solution. We are pleased that the President has said that he will veto this bill and demand a new bill that contains enough assistance. We oppose passage, and are confident that a fair solution will be quickly reached and enacted.